

REMARKS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of May 15, 2006 (hereinafter Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the three-month statutory period, no fee is believed due. Nonetheless, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Applicants thank the Examiner for noting at page 2 of the Office Action that Applicants' previous submission was sufficient to overcome the earlier-cited reference, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0002438 to Ohmura, *et al.* Applicants further thank the Examiner for removing the rejection of the claims based upon 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

In the Office Action, however, each of the claims was rejected on the basis of new grounds of rejection, as noted at page 4 of the Office Action. Claims 19 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,405,126 to Palomo *et al.* (hereinafter Palomo), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,405,123 to Rennard *et al.* (hereinafter Rennard), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,277 to Ashby *et al.* (hereinafter Ashby).

Applicants have amended Claims 19 and 26 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. The claim amendments, as discussed herein, are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

Claim Amendments

Claims 19 and 26 are directed to techniques of vehicle navigation. As amended, the claims recite that one aspect of Applicants' invention pertaining to vehicle navigation is the accessing of a publicly accessible Web site using a computing device

that is remote from a vehicle, and identifying within the Web site one or more destinations. More particularly, the one or more destinations are identified in response to a user input specifying trip information that defines an itinerary. The destinations correspond to at least one of the following, each identified based on the specified itinerary: a lodging, dining establishment, predetermined sightseeing attraction, and/or location to avoid (e.g., road hazard or detour). (See, e.g., Specification, p. 7, lines 11-20; see also p. 3, lines 14-19.)

The Claims, As Amended, Define Over The Prior Art

Palomo is directed to a system and method for finding an intended destination using an in-vehicle navigation system. (See Col. 2, lines 35-40, and Col. 5, line 48 – Col. 6, line 38.) As noted at page 3 of the Office Action, Palomo does not disclose accessing a Web site with a computing device to obtain navigation information. Rennard is cited, though, as disclosing this feature. Rennard is directed to an "interactive real-time distributed navigation system" by which navigation information is obtained in response to navigation prompts. (See Col. 7, lines 9-46; see also Abstract.) Ashby is cited in the Office Action as disclosing those features of Applicants' invention not found in either Palomo or Rennard, namely, that of determining whether the data format of retrieved navigation information conforms to the data requirements of an in-vehicle navigation device and converting such non-conforming data into a format that does conform to the in-vehicle navigation device.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references teach or suggest every feature recited in Claims 19 and 26, as amended. For example, none of the references teach or suggest that, upon accessing a Web site remote from a vehicle navigation system, information comprising one or more destination locations is determined in response to and based upon trip information defining an itinerary.

Specifically, none of the references teach or suggest a mechanism by which any of the following are identified in response to and based upon a submitted itinerary: a lodging, dining establishment, predetermined sightseeing attraction, road hazard, and/or detour, each identified at the Web site in response to and based upon the specified trip itinerary.

Palomo describes a destination list, including a hotel and restaurant. (See Col. 8, lines 21-29; see also FIG. 5.) Palomo presents the list to a user via a touch-screen, and interface by touching the screen, the user receives directions to the selected location. The directions provided in Palomo may be obtained from a global positioning satellite (GPS) system, but the destinations are pre-stored in the in-vehicle navigation system. (See Col. 7, lines 26-33.) Accordingly, Palomo fails to provide a mechanism whereby such destinations as a hotel or restaurant are identified based upon trip information defining an itinerary, as expressly recited in the amended claims. Even more fundamentally, as already noted, Palomo's determination of both a destination and corresponding directions are wholly unrelated to information stored at or retrieved from a Web site remote from the in-vehicle navigation system.

Rennard does involve a Web site, but does not teach or suggest utilizing the Web site in the manner taught by Applicants' invention. In Rennard, a user utilizes a remote Web site to input "destination information" such as "an address or an intersection of streets that define a geographic point." (Col. 12, lines 34-44.) In response to the user-supplied input, Rennard provides to the user "available information gathered from a larger pool of information," ostensibly stored at the Web site, "including a map, geographical traffic patterns and personalized information" that can later be provided through a wireless device to the in-vehicle navigation system. (Col. 12, lines 49-54.)

Rennard further describes "preplanning a trip." As explicitly described, Rennard's preplanning involves a computerized search to determine a destination to a location "several miles away," the location being explicitly identified by name such as, for

example, "Mom and Pop's Antique shop." (Col. 12, lines 55-65.) The name-based identification of a location that produces directions to that location, however, is not comparable to Applicants' invention. Specifically, it does not teach or suggest providing trip information defining an itinerary, which results in the identification of a lodging, dining establishment, predetermined sightseeing attraction, road hazard, and/or detour in response to and based upon the specified trip itinerary.

The newly-cited Ashby likewise fails to teach or suggest any of these particular features. Ashby, as already noted, is cited as disclosing the identification and conversion of non-conforming data so that the data can be used with a particular in-vehicle navigation system. Ashby, however, fails to teach or suggest those features of Applicants' invention lacking in both Palomo and Rennard.

Applicants thus respectfully submit that none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest every feature recited in amended Claims 19 and 26. Applicants respectfully maintain, therefore, that each of the claims defines over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the application in its present form is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this

Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 15, 2006



Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577

Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652

Marc Boillot, Registration No. 56,164

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Customer No. 40987

Post Office Box 3188

West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

Telephone: (561) 653-5000